

Application Number: 10/736,100

Amendments to Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions of claims in the application:

1. (Currently amended) A process to give a true indication of respondent satisfaction to an electronic questionnaire survey of a subject matter which is affected by human satisfaction,

~~which is characterised by~~ including the steps of:

asking the respondent or plurality of respondents to give their answers to two sets of questions on a computer

~~with both basing the said two~~ sets of questions ~~being based on~~ similar statements, but posed differently, so that the first said set of questions are answered emotionally by said respondent or plurality of respondents and the second said set of questions are answered rationally

the survey initiator ranking the said statements used in both said sets of questions dynamically generating the said second set of questions at the time of said questionnaire survey, based upon the answers to the said first set of questions

ranking the responses to both said sets of questions programmatically using said computer,

comparing said rankings from both said sets of questions programmatically using said computer

~~and based on these results,~~ recording computer calculated values for satisfaction and level of conviction within said computer's memory based on said comparison

~~both of which can be presented~~ presenting the said calculated values for satisfaction and level of conviction (the weighted score) to said respondent at the time of said survey on said computer's output device.

Application Number: 10/736,100

2. (Currently amended) The ~~method~~ process according to claim 1 of subdividing the said subject matter of said questionnaire survey into a number of ranked ~~common~~ groups in which the number of said statements is calculated and ~~are~~ equally distributed in number amongst the said groups and are ranked within the each said group according to the importance of the statement to the survey initiator.
3. (Currently amended) The ~~method~~ process according to claim 1 of defining two sets of said similar statements in which both sets of statements contain sentences with the same meaning, but using different words so that the first said set can be used in a set of questions designed to be responded to emotionally on said computer and the second said set can be combined to answer the questions rationally on said computer.
4. (Cancelled)
5. (Currently amended) The ~~method~~ process according to claim 1 of defining a said second set of questions programmatically on said computer in which said second set of questions are dynamically created by ~~dynamically~~ group grouping together a number of statements from said second set of statements at the time of questionnaire on said computer based on the responses to said first set of statements questions, ~~which force the respondent to respond~~ rationally.
6. (Cancelled)
7. (Currently amended) The ~~method~~ process according to ~~claim 6~~ claim 5 in which said second set of questions questions are defined so that the respondent is forced to respond rationally to said group of statements on said computer.
8. (Currently amended) The ~~method~~ process according to claim 1 of scoring and ranking said responses to said first set of questions programmatically on said computer in which said respondent's emotional response has a value calculated programmatically on said computer, which represents the level of conviction (also known as the "weighting") of said respondent's emotional responses to said questions and then ranked programmatically on said computer.

Application Number: 10/736,100

9. (Currently amended) The ~~method~~ process according to claim 1 of scoring and ranking said responses to said second set of questions programmatically on said computer in which said respondent's rational response has a value calculated programmatically on said computer, which represents the level of conviction (also known as the "weighting") of said respondent's rational responses to said questions and then ranked programmatically on said computer.

10. (Currently amended) The ~~method~~ process according to claim 1 of comparing said emotional and rational responses from said respondent or plurality of respondents programmatically on said computer in which the closeness of match of said emotional and rational responses is quantifiably measured on said computer, thereby giving a value for respondent or plurality of respondents' satisfaction.

11. (Cancelled)

12. (Cancelled)

13. (Currently amended) A process including the steps of:

~~of having storing~~ responses from said respondent to said first part of a said questionnaire survey from an input device ~~from said respondent~~ stored in a computer system, which is can be either a standalone system or part of network such as a local area network (LAN) or wide area network (WAN), ~~from an input device~~

~~so that processing~~ said responses ~~can then be processed~~ in a central processing unit in said system ~~and~~

dynamically arranging based on the results, said second set of statements based on the results to the said first part, for said second part of the questionnaire

presenting said second set of questions on a display device to said respondent for

completion ~~are dynamically arranged and presented as said second set of questions on a display device to said respondent for completion; after which~~

Application Number: 10/736,100

~~registering and processing~~ said respondent's resulting input on said input device is
~~once again registered and processed~~ in said processing unit ~~and finally~~
~~stored~~ storing said inputs in a storage device
~~so that outputting~~ a summary of said respondent's results ~~can be presented~~ to said
respondent in both a textual and graphical format on said display device, should it
be so desired.

14. (Cancelled)

15. (Currently amended) A ~~The~~ method process according to claim 13 of giving the said
respondent immediate feedback to a questionnaire survey intended to measure human
satisfaction in which a textual and/or graphical summary of their input is shown immediately
on the said display device following their completion of the electronic questionnaire survey.

16. (Cancelled)

17. (Cancelled)

18. (Cancelled)

19. (Currently amended) A process including the steps of:

~~either standalone or part of a network such as a local area network (LAN) or wide area~~
~~network (WAN), capable of~~

~~capturing and summarising inputs from a questionnaire survey~~ intended to record
human satisfaction from a respondent or plurality of respondents using a computer
on a standalone system or a local area network (LAN) or a wide area network
(WAN)

~~such that displaying the results so that~~ each questionnaire survey originator is able to
see results not only for their own entity, but also for a plurality of entities, typically
in the same industry (consisting of like-minded survey originators, who have
conducted the same questionnaire survey for their own entities) thereby

Application Number: 10/736,100

allowing performing industry wide benchmarking, which, because of the repeatability of the present invention, now becomes possible, for those surveys intended to record human satisfaction where such a feature would be beneficial.

20. (Currently amended) The ~~method~~ process according to claim 19 of assigning values to said respondents emotional responses which allow a simple summary of emotional responses from a plurality of respondents by using simple addition on a computer.

21. (Currently amended) The ~~method~~ process according to claim 19 of assigning values to said respondents rational responses which allow a simple summary of rational responses from a plurality of respondents by using simple addition on a computer.

22. (Currently amended) The ~~method~~ process according to claim 19 of adding the results of the emotional responses of all respondents in the survey originator's entity as well as their rational responses on a computer and comparing the two results, so that values can be mathematically assigned to both the entity's satisfaction and level of conviction (the weighted score) which are representative for the whole entity and are both devoid of human emotion and repeatable.

23. (Currently amended) The ~~method~~ process according to claim 19 of presenting the results from said survey both textually and graphically on a computing output device so that the survey originator sees both a summary of their own entity's results for satisfaction and level of conviction (the weighted score) as well as the results of a plurality of entities, thereby allowing an immediate benchmarking.